

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. The Examiner has rejected all of the claims based upon the Mathews reference.

The Applicants have amended each independent claim to further limit the scope of the present invention.

In each claim, the notion of "web browser", "web transmitted guide" and/or "web browser displayed hypertext link" is now included.

In general, the Mathews reference does not teach the use of a web browser in the same or similar manner as is now described in the amended claims.

Claim 1 originally included a limitation to merely a browser. This limitation has been further restricted to a "web browser" for the purpose of readily distinguishing the claims, as amended, from the Mathews reference. Claim 1 has also been amended to add the limitation to the guide being a "web transmitted guide" and the hypertext link being a "web browser displayed hypertext link".

First of all, in Matthews, an EPG server sends limited program information through the network to an EPG application which already contains the information about the grid. This limited program information is then executed on the user's side.

In other words, the entire guide is not transmitted from the EPG server -- only the data used to fill in the grids.

In contrast, the present invention may be readily deployed as a web browser which includes a web transmitted guide which includes in the transmission from the second location, information necessary to construct the grid.

Secondly, the browser of Mathews is only activated when a hypertext link is activated (column 8 lines 55-63).

In contrast, the guide of the present invention is only accessible via a web browser and, therefore, must exist before activation of the hypertext link, which has now been amended in Claim 1 to be limited to a web browser displayed hypertext link.

In other words, in Mathews, the browser does not exist until after the hypertext link is executed; and in claim 1, the browser must exist prior to the execution of the link.

The Mathews reference generally describes a system which is quite different from the claimed invention; e.g. the "coupled software" in column 10, lines 2-3 of Mathews, refers to the supplemental information that is retrievable using the hypertext link, whereas in the present invention, the software can be software resident on the PC that will either tune off the air or play the video, such as launching Media Player.

The Examiner has made other statements and rejections with respect to the dependent claims which the Applicants do not necessarily agree with; however, the salient differences between the claimed invention and the Mathews references render it unnecessary for the Applicants to address each assertion with respect to any disputed dependent claims.


For one or more of the same reasons as expressed above with respect to claim 1, the Applicants believe that when all of the limitations of the remaining claims are given their required consideration, it will be clear that these claims, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the Mathews reference. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the application be allowed and be permitted to move on to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Gregory G. Williams, Reg. No. 31,681
Simmons, Perrine, Albright & Ellwood, P.L.C.
Third Floor Tower Place
22 South Linn Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, Fax No. 703-872-9306, on December 10, 2003.


Gregory G. Williams